

Message Text

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 01 STATE 056188

10

ORIGIN NEA-09

INFO OCT-01 CCO-00 SS-10 SSO-00 ISO-00 NSCE-00 /020 R

66610

DRAFTED BY: NEA/INS:JNACH:MMK

APPROVED BY: NEA:ESWALKER

NEA/INS:DKUX

S/S-O:MTANNER

DIST: NSC-E

----- 022499

O 130200Z MAR 75 ZFF4

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO USDEL ASWAN IMMEDIATE

UNCLAS STATE 056188

TOSEC 426

FOR ASSISTANT SECRETARY ATHERTON

FOLLOWING REPEAT NEW DELHI 3398 ACTION SECSTATE INFO ISLAMABAD

11 MAR

QUOTE

UNCLAS NEW DELHI 3398

E.O. 11652: N/A

TAGS: PFOR IN PK US

SUBJECT: FONMIN CHAVAN'S SPEECH TO PARLIAMENT MARCH 10

REF: NEW DELHI 3386

1. FOLLOWING IS THE TEXT OF FONMIN CHAVAN'S STATEMENT
TO THE RAJYA SABHA SUMMARIZED IN REFTEL.

2. QUOTE:

RAJYA SABHA: CHAVAN'S REPLY TO DEBATE ON THE ARMS SUPPLIES

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 02 STATE 056188

TO PAKISTAN.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (Y.B. CHAVAN): MR. VICE-CHAIRMAN, SIR, I AM INDEED GRATEFUL TO HON. MEMBERS FOR GIVING ME THIS SECOND OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS AND EXPRESS MY VIEWS ON THIS VERY IMPORTANT DEBATE THAT IS GOING ON IN THE COUNTRY ABOUT THE ARMS SUPPLY TO PAKISTAN BY THE USA. MANY MEMBERS HAVE PARTICIPATED IN IT AND DIFFERENT SHADES OF NATIONAL OPINION FROM ANXIETY , CONCERN, DISAPPOINTMENT AND REGRET TO RESENTMENT, HAVE BEEN EXPRESSED. I SEE ALL SHADES OF OPINION EXPRESSED IN THIS DEBATE.

AND IT IS VERY HEARTENING TO SEE THAT THE ENTIRE NATION AND POLITICAL PARTIES OF ALL SHADES--RIGHT, CENTRE AND LEFT--ARE COMPLETELY UNITED IN REJECTING THIS POLICY, IN DISAPPROVING OF THE POLICY DECISION TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES IN SUPPLYING ARMS-- OR IN LIFTING THE EMBARGO ON ARMS SUPPLY--TO PAKISTAN. I WOULD NOT LIKE TO REPEAT THE WHOLE THING AGAIN BUT I WOULD LIKE TO GIVE SOME BACKGROUND AS TO HOW IT IS THAT THE WHOLE SITUATION CAME ABOUT. WE KNOW THE HISTORY OF THE LAST FEW YEARS, NEARLY TEN YEARS. AT ONE TIME, AMERICAN ON ITS OWN DECIDED THAT GIVING THIS SORT OF LETHAL ARMS EITHER TO INDIA OR PAKISTAN WAS NOT GOING TO HELP PEACEFUL CONDITIONS IN THE SUB-CONTINENT; IT WAS NOT THAT THEY COMPLETELY STOPPED THE SUPPLY OF ARMS. SOME ARE NON-LETHAL AND SOME LETHAL WEAPONS. THE DECISION WAS THAT THEY WOULD NOT GIVE LETHAL WEAPONS. BUT THERE WAS SOMETHING IN THAT SYSTEM OF ARMS SUPPLY BY THE IMPERIAL POWERS. SOMETIMES THERE ARE SOME COMPULSIONS WHICH FORCE THEM MAKE SOME SORT OF AN EXCEPTION BECAUSE IN 1970, THEY MADE SOME 'ONE-TIME EXCEPTION' WHICH ULTIMATELY RESULTED, AS WE KNOW, IN FURTHER BELLIGERENCY AND MILITANT ATTITUDE WHICH RESULTED IN PAKISTAN'S ARMED AGGRESSION AGAINST INDIA. ADMITTEDLY, THERE WAS THAT TILT. ADMITTEDLY, THERE WERE CERTAIN POSITIVE RESULTS OF WHAT HAPPENED ON THE SUB-CONTINENT. INDIA EMERGED AS A COUNTRY WHICH STOOD FOR JUSTICE, FOR THE LIBERATION OF THE OPPRESSED PEOPLE. JUSTICE WAS ON ITS SIDE, AND ON THE CAUSE IT SUPPORTED WAS SO JUST THAT IT GOT VICTORY. AND HAVING ACHIEVED A MILITARY VICTORY, WE TOOK A SERIES OF INITIATIVES AND STARTED A NEW PROCESS, ON OUR OWN, OF DETENTE

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 03 STATE 056188

ON THE SUB-CONTINENT, OF UNDERSTANDING THAT WITHOUT THE INTERFERENCE OF ANY OF THE BIG POWER, IT IS BETTER THAT WE TAKE OUR OWN INITIATIVES, BE LIBERAL, BE VERY GENEROUS, AND TRY TO REMOVE THE TENSIONS IN THIS AREA, BECAUSE THAT IS THE ONLY WAY OF BRINGING ABOUT PEACE IN THE WORLD. WHAT EXACTLY IS DETENTE PROCESS? DETENTE PROCESS IS A POSITION WHICH WOULD REMOVE AREAS OF TENSION, UNDERSTANDING THE NECESSITY AND THE COMPULSIONS OF CO-EXISTENCE--PEACEFUL

CO-EXISTENCE--BETWEEN TWO POWERS. THIS WAS EXACTLY WHAT WAS HAPPENING, AND ACTUALLY IT WAS OUR INTENTION. IT WAS, IN THINK, THE NECESSITY OF THE TIME TO SEE THAT THE FORCES WHICH INTERFERED WITH THIS PROCESS OF NORMALISATION OF RELATIONSHIP SHOULD ALSO BE NEUTRALISED THAT THEY SHOULD ALSO BE ENCOURAGED TO SUPPORT THIS PROCESS, THAT POWERS WHICH BY INTERFERENCE ALWAYS CREATED THIS SORT OF AN IMBALANCE SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED TO SUPPORT THIS POLICY. SO, THE GENESIS OF THE DISCUSSION WITH DR. KISSINGER, REALLY SPEAKING, AROSE OUT OF THIS OBJECTIVE CONDITION AND OF CERTAIN HISTORICAL NECESSITY, TO WHICH THERE WAS SOME RESPONSE FROM THE OTHER SIDE. THAT DOES NOT MEAN THAT WE WERE DECEIVED OR SOMEBODY WAS TRYING TO WORK OUT THE THEORY OF DECEPTION. I AM SAYING, AT LEAST WE WERE NOT DECEIVED; I CAN ASSURE NOT ONLY MR. BHUPESH GUPTA, BUT ALSO EVERY OTHER MEMBER OF THIS HOUSE THAT NONE OF US WAS DECEIVED. WE KNOW. I AM NOT DISCLOSING THE DISCUSSIONS BECAUSE THAT IS NOT DONE. BUT I WOULD LIKE TO TELL THIS HONOURABLE HOUSE AND THE COUNTRY THAT WHEN WE DECIDED TO SIT DOWN AND DISCUSS WITH THEM, WE REALLY WANTED TO FIND OUT WHAT ARE THE PERCEPTIONS, INTENTIONS, OF THE AMERICANS IN ASIA, IN THE SUB-CONTINENT, IN SOUTH EAST ASIA, IN THE GULF COUNTRIES.

WHAT ARE THEIR INTENTIONS ABOUT CERTAIN POSITIVE PROCESSES THAT THEY HAVE STARTED IN THIS PART OF THE WORLD? WHAT EXACTLY IS THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE NEW TYPE OF RELATIONSHIP THAT WAS BUILT IN ASIA WITH CHINA? IS IT AN UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN US AND CHINA? IF IT IS, THEN IT IS WELL AND GOOD BECAUSE WE WANTED THEIR RELATIONS TO BE GOOD. BUT WE CERTAINLY WANTED TO KNOW WHETHER IT IS GOING TO BE AT THE COST OF ANY OTHER NATION, PARTICULARLY WE IN THIS COUNTRY. SO WE STARTED UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 04 STATE 056188

THOSE DISCUSSIONS. WE WANTED TO UNDERSTAND AS TO WHAT EXACTLY IS THE POSITION. NOW I THINK IT IS A KNOWN FACT THAT WHAT MR. KISSINGER TOLD US, WHAT HE MADE IN HIS PUBLIC STATEMENTS WE HAVE ALSO LET IT KNOWN. ANYHOW, IT SEEMS THAT THEY ARE TAKING WRONG DECISIONS AT WRONG TIMES OR POSSIBLE RIGHT DECISIONS AT WRONG TIMES. I DO NOT KNOW WHAT IT IS. BUT THEY DECIDED, AND I THINK IT IS A GOOD THING THAT THEY DECIDED BEFORE I WENT THERE; OTHERWISE MY GOING TO WASHINGTON, IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE DECISION WAS TAKEN, WOULD HAVE GIVEN A GREATER SENSE OF DISAPPOINTMENT OR GREATER SENSE OF BEING CHEATED-- I AM GLAD TO USE A WRONG WORD RATHER THAT WAY. THEREFORE, IN THAT SENSE WE ARE NOT DECEIVED.

THE POINT IS WHAT ARE WE TO DO. WE STILL WANT MATURE RELATIONSHIP WITH ALL THE COUNTRIES. WE WANT MATURE

RELATIONSHIP WITH THE USA. WE WANT MATURE, REALISTIC RELATIONSHIP WITH ALL THE COUNTRIES. WHAT WE ARE TRYING TO SAY IS NOT MERELY A VERBAL PROTEST, AS MY HON'BLE FRIEND, MR. SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY, IS AFRAID TO SAY. WHAT WE ARE TRYING TO SHOW IS THE FALLACIES OF THE POLICIES THAT HAVE BEEN FOLLOWED BY THESE BIG POWERS. THE ARGUMENTS THAT THEY HAVE GIVEN IN SUPPORT OF WHAT THEY HAVE DONE ARE UNTENABLE, INVALID.....

BHUPESH GUPTA (CPI): OUTRAGEOUS.

Y.B. CHAVAN: WELL, THIS IS THE WAY WE USE A WORD, AND THEIR CREDIBILITY IS NOT LIKELY TO BE ACCEPTED IN THIS COUNTRY. AND THIS IS WHAT MR. TN KAUL SAYS. NOW LET US TAKE IT ARGUMENT BY ARGUMENT. THEY SAY, "HERE IS OUR ALLY. AND WE ARE IN A VERY CURIOUS POSITION. HERE IS OUR ALLY TO WHOM THE OTHER COUNTRIES ARE GIVING WEAPONS." AND THEN HE SAID THAT THEY DID NOT GIVE WEAPONS. THIS IS A RATHER VERY ABSURD ARGUMENT THAT HAS BEEN MADE FOR THE LAST SO MANY YEARS BY AMERICAN STATESMEN, FROM PRESIDENT EISENHOWER DOWN TO MR. KISSINGER, THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATOR. THEN THEY SAY THAT THEY WANTED US TO BE THEIR FRIENDS. WELL, THESE TWO THINGS LOOK RATHER CONTRADICTORY.

THEY ARE ALSO HAVING FRIENDSHIP WITH CHINA AND THEY ARE ALSO HAVING DETENTE. THEY WANT FRIENDSHIP WITH RUSSIA
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 05 STATE 056188

AND THEY ALSO WANT FRIENDSHIP WITH INDIA. THEN THEY WANT PAKISTAN AS AN ALLY. ALLY AGAINST WHOM? THEY ARE VERY INTELLIGENT PEOPLE AND I AM ENTITLED TO ASK THEM THIS QUESTION. YOU WANT PAKISTAN AS YOUR ALLY, BUT ALLY AGAINST WHOM.

BHUPESH GUPTA: WHAT DID YOU SAY?

Y B CHAVAN: THE OTHER POINT IS THAT HE OPENLY SAID THAT THEY ARE NOT INTERESTED AND THEY WILL NOT ENCOURAGE ARMS RACE. NOW THEY LIFT THE EMBARGO AND TELL US THAT THEY WOULD LIKE TO SUPPLY ARMS TO PAKISTAN IN THE INTEREST OF SECURITY TO KEEP THE STRATEGIC BALANCE. IS IT NOT ENCOURAGING THE ARMS RACE? IF NOT, WHAT IS IT? EITHER YOUR WORDS HAVE NO MEANING OR THOSE PEOPLE WHO TALK AND THOSE PEOPLE WHO LISTEN DO NOT UNDERSTAND. I REALLY DO NOT UNDERSTAND.

IT IS VERY DIFFICULT. THEY SAID PAKISTAN FEELS INSECURE. WELL, THAT IS THE SUBJECTIVE FEELING OF A COUNTRY. BUT YOU MUST PUT SOME OBJECTIVE TEST FOR IT. AS A MATTER OF FACT, AFTER THE LIBERATION OF BANGLADESH, PAKISTAN MAY HAVE CONTRACTED IN

ITS TERRITORY, BUT PAKISTAN HAS BECOME MORE COMPACT FROM THE SECURITY POINT OF VIEW.

FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF ARMS STRENGTH, FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF MANPOWER, PAKISTAN IS MORE POWERFUL TODAY THAN IT WAS IN 1971. IT IS A FACT.

BHUPESH GUPTA: THEY THEMSELVES ADMIT IT. LAST YEAR PRIME MINISTER BHUTTO SAID IT.

Y.B. CHAVAN: THAT IS RIGHT. MY POINT IS THAT THERE WAS NO QUESTION OF ANY SENSE OF INSECURITY IN PAKISTAN. IF WE APPLY OBJECTIVE CRITERIA TO THIS MATTER, IT IS NOT A FACT. HE HAS MADE A STATEMENT THAT WE ARE SPENDING ABOUT A BILLION DOLLARS A YEAR ON ARMS PURCHASE. WELL, CERTAINLY AS A MATTER OF FUNDAMENTAL POLICY, WE ARE TRYING TO BUILD OUR OWN DEFENCE INDUSTRIES AND OUR DEFENCE STRENGTH IN OUR OWN COUNTRY.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 06 STATE 056188

THERE IS NOTHING WRONG ABOUT IT. THIS IS ONE THING. THEN IF WE COMPARE THE BUDGETS, I THINK EXPERTS LIKE MR. SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY WILL VOUCHSAFE WHAT I AM SAYING, THE DEFENCE EXPENDITURE IS NORMALLY TAKEN EITHER IN TERMS OF PERCENTAGE OF THE GNP OR IN TERMS OF PERCENTAGE OF THE ANNUAL BUDGET. IF YOU SEE THIS YEAR'S ANNUAL BUDGET-- I HAVE CASUALLY SEEN IT; UNFORTUNATELY I HAVE NOT GONE DEEP INTO IT-- I THINK OUR DEFENCE EXPENDITURE IS ABOUT 20 TO 21 PERCENT, MAYBE 21 TO 22 PERCENT. AND IN TERMS OF GNP, I AM SURE IT IS NOT MORE THAN 4 PERCENT.

SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY (JANA SANGH): THREE PERCENT.

Y B CHAVAN: THREE TO FOUR PERCENT. I AM PREPARED TO TAKE THE HIGHER FIGURE.

SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: THE CORRECT FIGURE IS 3 PERCENT. WHY SAY 3 TO 4 PERCENT?

Y B CHAVAN: ALL RIGHT, 3 PERCENT. I AM PREPARED IN THIS MATTER TO BE A LITTLE MORE LIBERAL IN ORDER TO BE A LITTLE MORE CONVINCING TO THEM. IF WE COMPARE THE FIGURES OF PAKISTAN'S EXPENDITURE IN TERMS OF THEIR ANNUAL BUDGET, THEIR DEFENCE EXPENDITURE IS 56 PERCENT OF THE BUDGET AND IN TERMS OF GNP, IT COMES TO ABOUT 9 PERCENT.

BHUPESH GUPTA: TEN PERCENT

Y B CHAVAN: HERE I AM PREPARED TO COME DOWN. AFTER SEEING THESE THINGS, TO SAY THAT THERE IS A SENSE OF INSECURITY IN PAKISTAN IS SOMETHING VERY IRRATIONAL; IT IS AN IRRATIONAL IDEA THAT HAS BEEN PLANTED IN THE MIND OF PAKISTAN WHICH HAS A TRADITION OF RATHER INFLATED BELLIGERENCE. NEVERTHELESS THAT IS VERY HARMFUL TO PAKISTAN. AS WE WOULD LIKE TO EDUCATE AMERICANS THAT THEIR POLICY IS WRONG, WE WOULD CERTAINLY LIKE TO EDUCATE PAKISTAN LEADERSHIP, PAKISTAN STATESMEN, PAKISTAN GOVERNMENT AND IF WE CAN, THE PAKISTAN PEOPLE ALSO THAT THIS METHOD IS THE METHOD WHICH TAKES THEM TO RUIN.....

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 07 STATE 056188

BHUPESH GUPTA: I THINK WE BETTER SAY "WE WOULD LIKE PAKISTAN LEADERSHIP TO BE EDUCATED" RATHER THAN "WE WOULD LIKE TO EDUCATE THEM".

Y B CHAVAN: SO, SOME OF THESE ARGUMENTS WHICH HAVE BEEN MADE ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN ADMINISTRATION ARE ARGUMENTS WHICH ARE NOT ACCEPTABLE TO US AT ALL. THEY ARE NOT ACCEPTABLE NOT BECAUSE WE DO NOT LIKE THEM BUT BECAUSE THEY DO NOT STAND ANY OBJECTIVE SCRUTINY, ANY OBJECTIVE CRITERIA. THEREFORE THEIR POLICY IS BASICALLY WRONG. IF THY WANT PEACE IN THE WORLD, WHICH THEY CLAIM THY WANT--THEY SAY "WE WANT PEACE IN THE SUBCONTINENT AND WE WANT TO HELP IT"-- THEN THIS IS NOT THE POLICY TO DO THAT. EITHER YOU ARE DECEIVING YOURSELVES OR THE OTHER ALTERNATIVE IS, YOU ARE TRYING TO DECEIVE US. IT IS EITHER OF THE TWO; I DO NOT WANT TO MAKE ANY CHARGE. BUT LOGICALLY THERE SEEMS TO BE NO THIRD ALTERNATIVE IN THIS MATTER. I AM SAYING THIS FRANKLY BECAUSE I AM NOT CRITICISING FOR CRITICISM'S SAKE. I AM MAKING THIS FRANK ASSESSMENT IN ORDER TO BUILD MATURE RELATIONSHIP BECAUSE MATURE RELATIONSHIP MEANS FRANK ASSESSMENT OF EACH OTHER. THIS IS HOW I AM TRYING TO PUT IT BEFORE THE HOUSE.

NOW, THE MAIN POINT THAT ULTIMATELY WE HAVE TO CONSIDER IS: WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE? THIS IS THE MAIN POINT AS TO WHAT ULTIMATELY WE ARE TO DO. THERE IS NO SHORT CUT IN DEVELOPING OR GOING IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION AS FAR AS INTERNATIONAL POLICIES ARE CONCERNED BECAUSE IT IS A DIFFICULT WORLD, IT IS A CHANGING WORLD AND IT IS A COMPLEX WORLD IN WHICH WE HAVE TO ASSESS OUR OWN STRENGTH. WE HAVE TO HAVE OUR OWN OBJECTIVE PRINCIPLES OF POLICY AND FOLLOW THEM FIRMLY, WITH FULL FAITH AND THIS IS EXACTLY WHAT GOVERNMENT OF INDIA HAVE DECIDED TO DO. THIS IS WHAT GOVERNMENT OF INDIA IS DOING FOR THE LAST 25 YEARS. I THINK THE LEADERS WHO HAVE LAID DOWN THIS POLICY HAVE ACTED WISELY. THIS IS WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO TELL YOU

AGAIN THAT AT THE TIME OF EVERY CRISIS THE ENTIRE INDIAN PEOPLE HAVE STOOD BY THIS POLICY AND THAT IS BECAUSE THE BASIC POLICY IS VERY STRONG. THIS IS WHERE THE STRENGTH OF THE POLICY COMES.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 08 STATE 056188

IT IS A POLICY WHICH IS NOT MANIPULATED BY ANYBODY FOR RICH COUNTRIES ON THE PROMISE OF SUPPORT OR MANIPULATED BY ANY AMBITIOUS POLITICIANS. IT IS A POLICY WHICH HAS GROWN OUT OF CERTAIN CONVICTIONS AND THE LIFE OF THE PEOPLE. THEREFORE IT HAS THIS SORT OF STRENGTH. WHETHER PAKISTAN HAS DONE IT OR USA HAS DONE THIS, ULTIMATELY WHATEVER THEY DO, I ENTIRELY AGREE WITH ALL THE MEMBERS - NOT ANY PARTICULAR MEMBER, BUT I JUST REMEMBER THE LAST TWO SPEECHES BECAUSE THEY WERE THE LAST AND THEREFORE THEY ARE A LITTLE FRESH IN MY MIND - THAT ULTIMATELY THE FUNCTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL POLICY IS THE FUNCTION FOR INTERNAL UNITY OF THE PEOPLE AND ECONOMIC STRENGTH OF OUR OWN PEOPLE. AND FOR THAT MATTER WHAT WE WILL HAVE TO DO IS TO PURSUE THE POLICY OF NON-ALIGNMENT, PURSUE THE POLICY OF KEEPING UNITY OF THE THIRD WORLD, STRENGTHEN THE NON-ALIGNMENT MOVEMENT AND TRY TO BUILD UP RELATIONS BETWEEN OUR NEIGHBOURS TO WHICH WE HAVE GIVEN THE HIGHEST PRIORITY AND WHICH WE ARE PURSUING POSITIVELY, CONSISTENTLY, ENDLESSLY AND SUCCESSFULLY.

SOMEBODY MENTIONED ABOUT ASIAN SECURITY OR COLLECTIVE SECURITY. THIS IDEA IS FLOATED. BUT NOBODY HAS YET CONCRETISED OR DEFINED WHAT IT MEANS. IF IT MEANS CREATING AN ATMOSPHERE OF ECONOMIC OR POLITICAL CO-OPERATION IN ASIA, YES; WELL AND GOOD; IT IS ALL RIGHT. BUT THE CONDITIONS HERE WILL HAVE TO BE OBJECTIVELY SEEN AND THEN WE HAVE TO GO AHEAD. PERSONALLY WE FEEL THERE ARE CERTAIN REGIONAL AREAS WHICH ARE DIFFICULT. THERE ARE CERTAIN AREAS IN WHICH THERE ARE TENSIONS AND THROUGH SOME SIMLA PROCESS WE HAVE TO TRY TO ELIMINATE THESE THINGS AND STRENGTHEN RELATIONSHIP. THERE ARE CERTAIN CONTRADICTIONS IN THE SITUATION IN THE GULF COUNTRIES. THERE ARE CERTAIN CONTRADICTIONS IN SOUTH EAST ASIA. WE HAVE TO REMOVE THESE ON THE BASIS OF A NETWORK OF BILATERAL RELATIONSHIP AND THEN THERE MAY BE SOME SORT OF MULTI-LATERAL IDEA OF CO-OPERATION. WE DO NOT WANT TO GIVE AN IDEA THAT COLLECTIVE SECURITY IS AIMED AT ANYBODY. THIS IS NOT WHAT WE MEAN. I AM VERY GLAD THAT THIS PROCESS IS ON NOT IN THE SUBCONTINENT, BUT ELSEWHERE, DESPITE THIS DECISION OF US TO SUPPLY ARMS TO PAKISTAN. AND WHAT WE SAID HAS COME TRUE. WITHIN FIFTEEN DAYS OF THE ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE DECISION ON U.S. ARMS AID TO PAKISTAN, BHUTTO'S LANGUAGE HAS CHANGED. HE WAS SAYING HE WANTS TO FOLLOW SIMLA AGREEMENT. BUT FOR THE FIRST TIME AFTER A LONG TIME HE SPOKE THE LANGUAGE OF WAR. WELL, SOMETIMES I FEEL NOT TAKING HIM SERIOUSLY. BUT EXPERIENCE HAS SHOWN THAT YOU CANNOT TAKE HIM COMPLACENTLY ALSO.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 09 STATE 056188

BUT, REALLY SPEAKING, HE KNOWS ABOUT IT. ULTIMATELY, THIS WRONG LANGUAGE AND WRONG STEP WILL LEAD TO RESULTS WHICH ARE NOT GOING TO BE HEALTHY RESULTS FOR THEM ALSO. WHAT I AM TRYING TO TELL YOU IS THAT WE ARE TRYING TO MAKE THE AMERICANS SEE THAT THIS IS THE RESULT OF THEIR DOING. OUR MAIN POINT WAS THAT BY LIFTING THIS EMBARGO THEY MAY WEAKEN THE PSYCHOLOGY OF NORMALISATION OF THE RELATIONS AND THEY WILL NOT HELP IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF GOOD RELATIONS BETWEEN THE TWO COUNTRIES AND THIS EXACTLY HAS JUST STARTED THIS PROCESS. BUT I WOULD LIKE TO ASSURE THIS HOUSE, THIS COUNTRY AND THE WORLD THAT DESPITE ALL TALKS OF WAR BY OTHERS, WE ARE NOT TALKING IN TERMS OF WAR. WE ARE A COUNTRY DEDICATED TO THE CAUSE OF PEACE, WORLD PEACE, AND WE WILL MAKE ALL EFFORTS TO REMOVE ANY MISUNDERSTANDINGS BETWEEN THE TWO COUNTRIES AND TRY TO STRENGTHEN THE SPIRIT OF THE SIMLA AGREEMENT AND PROCEED ON THAT BASIS.

BHUPESH GUPTA: YOU SHOULD STRENGTHEN THE SPIRIT OF THE SIMLA AGREEMENT.

Y.B. CHAVAN: YES.

WE ARE VERY GLAD, AS SOMEBODY JUST NOW SAID, THAT THE PRESIDENT OF AFGHANISTAN IS AMIDST US AND WE CERTAINLY WANT TO HAVE GOOD RELATIONS WITH AFGHANISTAN AND WE ALSO WANT THAT AFGHANISTAN - PAKISTAN RELATIONS SHOULD ALSO BE GOOD, AND THAT THE RELATIONS BETWEEN AFGHANISTAN AND IRAN ARE ALSO VERY GOOD.

AS WAS JUST NOW MENTIONED, FOR THE LAST SO MANY MONTHS A CONTROVERSY ABOUT THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN IRAQ AND IRAN WAS IN THE AIR. BUT WE HAVE GOOD AND FRIENDLY RELATIONS WITH BOTH IRAN AND IRAQ AND I AM VERY GLAD INDEED THAT AN AGREEMENT HAS BEEN ARRIVED AT BY THE LEADERS OF IRAQ AND IRAN ON THEIR MAJOR BILATERAL PROBLEMS. OUR SATISFACTION OVER THIS DEVELOPMENT IS ALL THE GREATER SINCE WE HAVE TRADITIONALLY CLOSE AND FRIENDLY RELATIONS WITH THESE TWO COUNTRIES. LET ME TAKE THIS OPPORTUNITY AND CONVEY OUR SINCERE CONGRATULATIONS TO THE LEADERS OF BOTH THESE COUNTRIES. SO, THIS IS OUR APPROACH IN THIS PARTICULAR MATTER. SO, AS I HAVE SAID, ULTIMATELY, WHAT WE HAVE TO DO IS NOT MERELY TO SEE WHAT WE DO WITH THIS JOINT COMMISSION OR THAT JOINT COMMISSION--THESE ARE SMALL MATTERS AND SMALL ISSUES AND THESE ARE NOT ISSUES ON WHICH WE SHOULD CONCENTRATE OUR ENERGIES--BUT ALSO TO SEE THE DIRECTIONS WHICH ULTIMATELY WE WANT TO TAKE, TO SEE WHAT THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF POLICY ARE BY WHICH YOU WANT US TO BE GUIDED IN THIS PARTICULAR SITUATION, AND, ULTIMATELY, WE WILL HAVE TO PURSUE OUR OWN POLICY OF BUILDING

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 10 STATE 056188

UP OUR RELATIONS WITH OUR NEIGHBOURS AND WITH OTHER COUNTRIES AND, AT THE SAME TIME, NOT NEGLECTING BUILDING UP AND STRENGTHENING OUR ECONOMY, BUILDING UP THE UNITY OF OUR PEOPLE AND BUILD-

ING UP SELF-RELIANCE IN THE MATTER OF DEFENCE PRODUCTION IN THIS
COUNTRY AND THAT ALONE WILL GIVE US THE STRENGTH OF NATIONAL
SECURITY.

FRIENDS, I DO NOT THINK I CAN ADD MORE THAN THIS AND I DO NOT
THINK I CAN TAKE ANY MORE OF YOUR TIME. THANK YOU.SAXBE
UNQUOTE INGERSOLL

UNCLASSIFIED

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: MILITARY ASSISTANCE, TOSEC 426, SPEECHES
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 13 MAR 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: n/a
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: n/a
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment:
Disposition Date: 01 JAN 1960
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975STATE056188
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: NEA/INS:JNACH:MMK
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D750087-0447
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750353/aaaabvur.tel
Line Count: 446
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ORIGIN NEA
Original Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 9
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: n/a
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: 75 NEW DELHI 3386
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: ShawDG
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 13 JUN 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <13 JUN 2003 by SilvaL0>; APPROVED <02 MAR 2004 by ShawDG>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
05 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: FONMIN CHAVAN'S SPEECH TO PARLIAMENT MARCH 10
TAGS: PFOR, MASS, IN, PK, US, (CHAVAN, Y B)
To: ASWAN
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006